

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ANDERSON DIVISION

Earnest E. Vaughn, Sr.,	)	C.A. No. 8:07-1288-TLW-BHH
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	ORDER
	)	
Officer Dale Logan, and the City of	)	
Anderson,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

---

The Plaintiff brought this *pro se* civil action against the Defendants under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

The Plaintiff's claims center around his allegedly improper arrest and detention in the Anderson County Detention Center. On August 2, 2007, the Defendants moved for summary judgment. The Plaintiff responded on August 20, 2007, and filed a motion to amend his complaint that same day.

This matter is now before the undersigned for review of the Report and Recommendation ("the Report") filed February 5, 2008, by United States Magistrate Judge Bruce Hendricks, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). In her Report, Magistrate Judge Hendricks recommends that the Defendants' motion for summary judgment be granted and that the Plaintiff's claim be dismissed with prejudice. The Plaintiff has not objected to the Report.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of

objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983).

In light of this standard, the Court has carefully reviewed the Report and has concluded that the Report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. # 33), and the Defendants' motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED** (Doc. # 24), and the Plaintiff's motion to amend, filed after the summary judgment motion, which does not change the nature of the Plaintiff's claims, is **DENIED** (Doc. # 28).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
S/ Terry L. Wooten  
**TERRY L. WOOTEN**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

March 7, 2008  
Florence, South Carolina